BILDERBERG MEETINGS

THE HAGUE, 31 October 1972
SCHEVENINGSEWEG 1
TELEPHONE 111949
TELEGRAMS BILDERMEETINGS

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE
STEERING COMMITTEE.

7

Dear Sir,

Enclosed you will find the Minutes of the two Steering Committee meetings at Soestdijk Palace on 21 and 22 October.

After completing the Minutes we received the news that Messrs. Kohnstamm and Janssen talked with Monsieur Fernand Spaak. He has agreed to write a paper on the first Agenda item. He will be available for the Steering Committee meeting of January 21st and of course for the Conference.
Monsieur Spaak is quite prepared and anxious to contact his American colleque who will be chosen to write the other working paper on the first subject.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

N.le Roy

N.le Roy

Bilderberg Meetings

October 1972

MINUTES

OF 2 MEETINGS OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Soestdijk Palace

on 21 and 22 October 1972

Present:

H.R.H. The Prince of the Netherlands

Ernst H. van der Beugel

Joseph E. Johnson

Giovanni Agnelli

M. Nuri Birgi

Il Marchese Cittadini Cesi

Arthur H. Dean

Anthony G.S. Griffin

Daniel Janssen

Max Kohnstamm

Reginald Maudling

James A. Perkins

Baron Edmond de Rothschild

Shepard Stone

Terkel M. Terkelsen

Otto G. Tidemand

Marcus Wallenberg

Otto Wolff von Amerongen

Mr. Wallenberg was accompanied by Mr. Nils Svensson, who will handle the arrangements for the 1973 Saltsjöbaden Conference.

ilderberg Meetings

Saturday afternoon session

Discussion on General Aspects of Bilderberg Meetings.

The discussion centered around the question whether the Bilderberg Meetings should now move beyond their original aim, namely "maintaining and deepening the dialogue between North America and Western Europe". This question was raised with particular reference to the problems presented by the emergence of Japan as a major world power.

After an extensive discussion in which different views were presented, a consensus was reached on the point that the present state of relations between North America and Europe fully justified the maintenance of the primary objectives of Bilderberg.
It was in this framework that the question of Japanese participants was discussed.
There was agreement that the question of finding qualified Japanese participants, which posed a problem a few years ago, was not an obstacle any more.
Considerable attention was given to the question whether an invitation to the Japanese to attend a Bilderberg Conference would necessarily imply extending an invitation for every conference, and even institutionalizing the arrangement by inviting them to the Steering Committee.
Consensus was reached on the point that it should be possible and desirable to invite Japanese on an ad hoc basis for subjects in which they were particularly involved.
A necessary condition for this procedure would, however, be to explain to prospective Japanese participants the primary aims of Bilderberg as a forum for a North American-European dialogue. This opinion of the Steering Committee implies that the typical topics for the North American-European dialogue would continue to be discussed in a frank and unhibited manner among the countries directly concerned.

ilderberg Meetings

There was general agreement that, in view of the topics decided upon, it would not be in order to invite Japanese to Saltsjöbaden.
It was decided that, in view of the importance of the issue and the fact that a few members of the Steering Committee were not present, the question of Japanese participants could again be on the Agenda of the Steering Committee in Saltsjöbaden.

There followed a substantive discussion about the composition of the Annual Conference.
There was agreement that a larger proportion of younger participants should be invited than in the past, with particular emphasis on seeking to find persons who appear to be potential leaders. It is important to include some who can be expected to challenge thoughtfully - or even reject - assumptions or beliefs often accepted in previous meetings. At the same time, every effort should be made to avoid inviting those whose views are so extreme or their manner so abrasive as to preclude constrictive dialogue.
Attention was drawn to the importance of having a better representation from a) the age group of 30-45, and b) trade unions, as well as maintaining a fair sampling of the academic world and the news media.
The participation of women should be continued.
The importance was stressed to invite as many people as possible who were effective in communicating the Bilderberg experience.

The Secretariat draw the attention to the fact that for the European countries and Canada it would not be possible to have a balanced representation on a national scale, the groups being too small for that.It was therefore decided that at the January meeting of the S.C. an effort should be made to make the European and Canadian group of participants balanced as a whole. In view of the size of U.S. participation, the Americans could balance their group more easily.

Sunday morning session

Agenda and Working Papers.

While everybody agreed that it would be appropriate and important to discuss the energy situation and its impact on American-European relations, there was, at the same time, a strong desire of some members of the Steering Committee to discuss a subject which was directly related to the present state of relations between North America and Europe. A compromise was found in the adoption of the following two Agenda items:

I The possibilities of the development of a European energy policy, and the consequences for European-North American relations.

II Conflicting expectations concerning the European Security Conference.

It was decided that Mr. Kohnstamm and Mr. Janssen should approach Monsieur F. Spaak of E.E.C. to write the working paper on the first Agenda item.
Mr. Johnson will, in consultation with other American members of the Steering Committee, invite an American to write a paper from the American side. Among possible authors the names were mentioned of Mr. Robert Anderson, Mr. Glenn Seaborg, Mr. David Freeman and Mr. George Piercy.
A third paper would be prepared, setting forth the main facts of the energy situation.
Mr. Johnson will approach the Ford Foundation, and if this would prove to be difficult, there are many alternative sources.

It was further agreed that the two authors of the working papers should be in close contact with each other and the Secretariat, in order to coordinate their work, and to bring out a number of precise discussion points.

ilderberg Meetings

Among these discussion points were mentioned the different European interests - the role of the oil companies - conflicts between energy requirements and ecological priorities - the consequences of developments in the energy situation on European-North American relations, and the balance of payments implications.

Mr. Tidemand will approach Mr. Stoltenberg, former Secretary of State in the Norwegian Government, to write a working paper in which the positive elements of the European Security Conference are stressed.
Mr. Johnson will approach an American to write a working paper in which the more sceptical point of view is presented.

The authors will be invited to the next Steering Committee meeting with the request to have an outline of their paper available at that moment.
The working paper itself should preferably not exceed 15 pages.

Participants

Belgium:	4	(including 2 members of the S.C.)
Canada:	4	(including 1 member of the S.C.)
Denmark:	3	(including 1 member of the S.C.)
Finland:	1	
France:	7	(including 2 members of the S.C.)
Germany:	7	(including 2 members of the S.C.)
Iceland:	1	
International:	4	(including 1 member of the S.C.)
Italy:	6	(including 1 member of the S.C.)
Netherlands:	3	
Norway:	4	(including 2 members of the S.C.)
Sweden:	6	(including 1 member of the S.C.)
Switzerland:	2	(including 1 member of the S.C.)
Turkey:	2	(including 1 member of the S.C.)
U.K.:	7	(including 2 members of the S.C.)
U.S.A.:	18-20	(including 10 members of the S.C.)

The European and Canadian members of the Steering Committee were requested to send in as soon as possble (but not later than the end of November) their suggestions for participants, but they were asked to send in more names than their quota. This will enable the Steering Committee and the Secretariat to aim at a balanced composition of the European and Canadian group, which was discussed on Saturday afternoon (see page 3).

This implies that with a few exceptions of active statesmen, no participant - other than paper writers - should already be approached before the Steering Committee meeting of January 1973.

The next Steering Committee meeting will take place at Soestdijk Palace on Sunday, 21 January, 1973 at 10.30 a.m.. The Chairman envisages a full day meeting.

Bilderberg Meetings

A G E N D A

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

SOESTDIJK PALACE

21 October 1972

5 p.m.

1) Opening;

2) Discussion of general aspects of Bilderberg Meetings.
(see notes of June 28th 1972 and September 28th and letters from Mr. Culver and Mr. Johnson)

SOESTDIJK PALACE

22 October 1972

11 a.m.

1) Opening;

2) Place and date of the next Conference;

3) Agenda for the Conference and discussion on persons who should be approached to write introductory papers;

4) Persons to be invited;

5) Place and date of the next meeting of the Steering Committee;

6) Other business

BILDERBERG MEETINGS

The Hague, 28 September 1972

From: Joseph E. Johnson
Ernst H.van der Beugel

To: The members of the Steering Committee

Steering Committee meeting

October 21st and October 22nd.

1) This note should be read in conjunction with van der Beugel's"Note on Bilderberg Meetings"which was circulated on June 28th and is again enclosed herewith.

2) We suggest that we start our Saturday meeting by giving members of the Steering Committee an opportunity to give their comments on the note of June 28th. Some have already done so in writing and their reactions are circulated together with this note.

3) With respect to the possible participation of Australians and Japanese it will appear that the two cases are quite different. We suggest that Australians will not be considered as continuing members, but that Australians be invited ad hoc,in relation to their potential contribution to the agenda of a particular meeting.

As far as the Japanese are concerned it must be recognized that Japan is not only the sole non-communist industrialized country, that is not a regular participant of Bilderberg, but indeed the third most productive country in the world. Moreover, experience going back many years, suggests that the Japanese are highly sensitive about their relations with Canadians, Americans and Europeans. This sensitivity is such, that we must take it very much into account in our decisions. In this connection it seems quite clear that, as van der Beugel's memorandum on 28 June stated, once the Japanese are invited, they will probably have to be considered as permanent members with representation on the Steering Committee.

The fact that matters of interest to Japan are discussed at Bilderberg will undoubtedly become known to prominent Japanese, and as their concern about their relationship to the other industrialized countries grows, the fact that they are not invited to Bilderberg could also lead to sensitive reactions.

One strong argument in favour of the inclusion of the Japanese is that during the 1970's there is unlikely to be any question discussed at Bilderberg of significance, in which the Japanese are not involved or with respect to which they do not have views, and perhaps even responsibilities. Even though not a nuclear power they are now, as was made clear at Knokke, one of the "poles" of the East-Asian power quadrangle. Moreover, it is clear that questions of world trade will center for some time upon the role of Japan and the relationship to the other industrialized countries, most particularly those of Western Europe and the United States and Canada.

On the other hand it is a fact that some members of the Steering Committee have expressed the view that this does not necessarily mean that Japanese should participate in Bilderberg Meetings. Moreover, some members have doubts as to whether there are many Japanese who are both informed and sophisticated with respect to the issues to be discussed, and sufficiently at ease in a group of Westerners, to participate effectively in the discussions and without weakening the spirit of frankness and directness, that has characterized Bilderberg from the beginning.

We strongly urge that the decision be taken now as to whether Japanese should be invited to the Saltsjöbaden Meeting. If the decision is affirmative, we should consider now institutionalizing Japanese participation by inviting a Japanese to serve on the Steering Committee.

BILDERBERG MEETINGS

[illegible] 25 June 1972

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

BILDERBERG MEETINGS

1) At the last Steering Committee meeting in Knokke we agreed that we would discuss in the afternoon of October 1st several substantive and procedural questions about the annual meetings, before we discuss the subject and the other relevant questions of the Salt Sjöbaden Meeting.

2) I might try to list a few issues in connection with our annual meetings. It is, I think, useful to mention that too long after our last meeting [illegible] are still fresh. It might also [illegible] we should discuss eventual improvements in our procedures.

3) First some general remarks.

a) Bilderberg is not a meeting of experts, but [illegible] people from different walks of life [illegible] topics of common interest with the general aim of strengthening the cohesion of the industrialized world and the particular aim of maintaining and deepening the [illegible] between North America and Western Europe. In this Bilderberg is unique, and I [illegible] that basic formula should be maintained.

b) It implies, however, that the meeting is a mixture of top-level experts and people who are just interested in the issue at stake. This creates a certain [illegible] certainly an unusual [illegible] be cured or improved. I do not think [illegible]

cure would mean abandoning our basic formula.

Restricting the discussion to the experts would kill the conference.

Spending part of the meeting in smaller groups would imply that we lose the basic advantage of everybody being present when the discussion takes place, and it would mean furthermore that we pretend to be a group of experts, which we are not.

I suggest therefore that we accept this other side of the real and live with the disadvantage of our own formula.

c) In judging the success of a particular meeting, members of the Steering Committee should bear in mind that only they can compare the meeting with many previous ones. Most of the participants only attend one or two meetings and for them the comparison does not exist. What really matters is not only the question whether the discussion was good or sometimes less than we should desire but the total impression of the meeting, including the numerous and many times highly valuable social contacts outside the sessions. To simplify it: the fact that President X of country Y dines with Minister Z or journalist A or Professor B. This is essential in our formula, and I do think that this is an most unique element in Bilderberg.

4) **If we accept this general framework, there certainly is [illegible] need for improvement and [illegible].**

5) Belgian and Dutch did their utmost to find a place where everybody could live in the same hotel. We have been unfortunately unsuccessful, but I think that in the future the "one hotel concept" should be maintained, even at the cost of the luxury. Somehow two hotels are a definite disadvantage for the ambiance of the conference.

6) Working papers and topics.

a) Working papers should be limited to 15 pages at the maximum.

b) If possible they should represent different and preferably opposite points of view.
The disadvantage of the Knokke papers was that all four represented approximately the same basic point of view.

c) Preferably we should have two items on the agenda.
The agenda item in Knokke was too large (in spite of the fact that some participants complained in the meeting that we did not discuss also Vietnam, the Third World etc. etc.).

d) We should stress more than we did in the last few meetings that working papers should end by mentioning a few clear, concise points on which the discussion should be focussed and which should, if possible, be controversial.
If authors of the working papers are not willing to do this, the secretariat should prepare the papers circulate a list of topics on which the discussion will be focussed.

7) Procedures at the meeting.

a) Not only should the five minutes rule be strictly adhered to, but those who get more than five minutes should be clearly told that the upper limit is 15 minutes. The trouble is that some people simply refuse to keep the rules, as we had one case in Knokke where the speaker was warned that 15 minutes was the limit and went on for I think 40 minutes. [illegible] cases there are no rules. Only God can intervene.

b) We should insist that interventions be limited to the topics mentioned in the working papers or in a note of the secretariat. (see 6d)

c) We should make it clear to participants that they will be given a chance to talk several times and therefore won't have to say everything when they first get the floor.

d) We should tell participants that if they want to take on something that links or bridges several topics, they must clear this beforehand with the Chair.

e) The "one minute rule" worked very well in Knokke and should be strongly encouraged.

f) [illegible] attention" is 1½ to 2 hours at the maximum. [illegible] the tea and coffeebreak will be, and when the sessions will be terminated.

g) Sunday morning is a problem. On the one hand we need it because otherwise participants would leave on Saturday evening, while that evening is "socially" the [illegible].

f) The political stars. I think it is a feature of Bilderberg to invite a few active top government people. We should continue to do so. I should mention, however, that their overcrowded and unpredictable schedules make it highly uncertain whether they will really appear. (In Knokke this was the case with Helmut Schmidt, Reggy Maudling and Henry Kissinger who all three very much wanted to come.)

g) I think that we should be careful in the balance between business and non-business among the participants. I had the feeling that in Knokke, and certainly in view of the subject we dealt with, business was slightly overrepresented.

h) Last but not least, the question of the young. In Knokke we have not been completely successful in obtaining a fair participation of the younger non-establishment, but it is inevitable that this varies from year to year. In further consideration of this aspect of Bilderberg I think that, while it is very necessary to have a fair amount of younger people, the main point is that we invite people who differ in their basic assumptions about political and economic problems from the majority of traditional Bilderberg participants. This is something which has a certain relation to age, but not a total one. The main differences in the approach to Western societies and the order of priorities connected with these different approaches often run right through all different age-levels. It is more important to have these different views present at the meeting than cling to a certain percentage of "under thirties".

Furthermore, I think that quite apart from opinions the 30-45 age level is extremely important for the future of Bilderberg. It struck me that our North-American friends had more representatives of that group in Knokke than the Europeans.

9) I hope that these far from complete suggestions might contribute to our discussion of October 21st and 22nd.

[illegible]

[illegible] WORKING PAPER [illegible]

Unfortunately, Alastair Buchan was prevented to attend the meeting [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

- Characteristics of the sixties.
  U.S. central pillar of system of alliances, not only in free developed, world, but in developing world as well.
  [illegible] with U.S. and Europe and evading policy of containment by [illegible]

- [illegible]

  a) Strategic parity of the Soviet Union and very ac[illegible] towards Europe.
  [illegible] hemisphere.

  Having said this great many reservations.Soviet has not achieved anything significant by their strategic build up. It might, however, affect the way U.S. is able to act in [illegible]
  Great power relations in the Far East may show some of the characteristics of nineteenth century balance of power in Europe, but there are great differences.
  It is not entirely a military balance of power, but rather the interplay of four rather antagonistic cultures.
  The change in power relations does not mean Soviet policy aiming at long range accomodation in Western Europe.
  [illegible] attitude will continue to be basicly hostile, because [illegible]

[illegible]

Mainly trading [illegible]

[illegible] military [illegible] Mediterranean [illegible]

In elaborating t[illegible] Buchan will [illegible]

He will give
deal with
situation.
Messrs. Buchan, Kohns

[illegible]

[illegible]

Ball and Buchan paper on the second [illegible].

[illegible] invite either Mr.Sharp or Mr. Raynauld to open [illegible].

Mr.Deniau will be approached by Mr.Kohnstamm to open the discussion on the second day, and as an alter[illegible] to invite Prince Colonna for the same purpose.

Attention was drawn to the fact that both the Blumenthal and the Kohnstamm-van der Beugel papers were not representative for the more eurocentric approach to the problems under consideration an approach which was shared by an important element in [illegible].

It was left to the discussion between Mr.Kohnstamm and Mr.Deniau whether Mr.Deniau would wish to present his point of [illegible] orally or in a short written statement, which could [illegible] circulated before the Conference.

[illegible]

[illegible] meeting will be held at the hotel [illegible] at Knokke, on Thursday, [illegible] from New York to London on that day.

[illegible]

STEERING COMMITTEE

7

Dear Sir,

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Mr. Culver's letter to the Prince.

[illegible]

but Messrs. Johnson and van der Beugel also gave their reactions, copies of which I enclose.

Yours sincerely,

N.le Roy

Bilderberg Secretariat

[illegible] a letter [illegible] [illegible] E. Johnson to Ernst H. van der Beugel.

"[illegible] only really substantive comment that I had on [illegible] of any reference to a [illegible] one that I [illegible] side. That is the [illegible] getting good people from organized labor [illegible] political non-[illegible] with the one exception of Walter [illegible] -- I think -- Wiesbaden, we have [illegible] a really good [illegible]ive of American labor, and many people would say that he is not a typical one. Serious efforts on my part in the last couple of years, supported by members of the American Steering Committee, have [illegible] been successful. In each case good excuses were given [illegible] I have a feeling that labor leaders tend to [illegible] something that has such strong "establishment" leadership. I think we might well get the question of representation [illegible] those segments of our societies before the Steering Committee [illegible] meeting in October. There is also in my mind the question [illegible] of whether, in view of the increasing importance that [illegible] agriculturally oriented persons.

Turning now to John Culver's letter to the Prince, it does seem to me that this letter and its implications should also be on the agenda of the meeting in October. I do not know whether Culver sent copies of that letter to all members of the Steering Committee but I am sure that he would not object if were to do so. I believe that all American members have in fact received it.

[illegible] Perhaps we [illegible] the basis of a little [illegible] both of us, [illegible] whether. In any case the [illegible] before the [illegible] Commission [illegible]

I agree [illegible] your letter to Culver [illegible] that you [illegible] top of [illegible], and [illegible] I have [illegible] indicate that [illegible] was not [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

The Honorable John S. Culver
U.S. House of Representatives
Room 107, Cannon House Office Building
[illegible]

Let us ch
valuable contribution
and adapt
confusing political c

JOHN C. CULVER
[illegible]

[illegible]
FOREIGN AFFAIRS
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

[illegible]

[illegible]

Your Royal [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] at Knokke. [illegible] that there [illegible] the existence of [illegible] years.

[illegible] as an example, [illegible] welcome and perhaps [illegible] very [illegible] an act [illegible] penny. Of course I [illegible] valid crisis, and I [illegible] Administration since [illegible] both the legal and [illegible] treaty, [illegible]

it considers appropriate, whi[illegible] not include the use of armed force, and even [illegible] is to be taken only in accordance with [illegible] nal processes. As a practical matter, [illegible] of an armed [illegible] response [illegible] the presence of [illegible] convention [illegible] the Western theater, [illegible] these arrangements, [illegible]

[illegible] protracted de-[illegible]

Second, [illegible] about the irrutability of arrange[illegible] strength and cohesiv[illegible] cifically, they question th[illegible] force level of 215,000 troops in [illegible]

and Greece that are [illegible] presence. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] it seem to be any longer sufficient to comfort our-[illegible]

[illegible] expertise. [illegible]

[illegible] have some [illegible] messenger both to and from [illegible]

I am convinced that now is the time when those of us who do possess shared beliefs, must in our own self interest, confront honestly the necessity to continuously examine the presumptions and assumptions, both foreign and domestic, upon which our strategy is based and above all insure that the rationale given this foreign policy is currently meaningful, credible and acceptable to the people for whom it was intended to serve and upon whose support it is dependent for its success.

The problem which has concerned me at the Bilderberg meetings has been the gulf between the general security policy views of conference participants, however valid, and the contemporary attitudes and perceptions of European and American public opinion, and the refusal of conference members generally to soberly address themselves to this critical issue.

It would be my hope that perhaps such elements of realism, debate, and widened perspective might be incorporated in your future meetings. I would certainly not suggest that the builders and animators of Bilderberg pass from the scene. It is certainly equally important that the views of men now in high official position or in former high position as well as men and women who play leading roles in business, communications, and other sectors of private life be clearly heard. All I would suggest with utmost respect is that a somewhat wider diversity of viewpoint be achieved and a more authentic canvas of relevant positions made. Unfortunately this is not an age of easy consensus either in my country or in several others from which you draw conferees. I am well aware that the introduction of women and more youthful representation in recent conferences is the kind of innovation which responds to this sensed need. In this period of our history we are much more likely to sustain our foreign policies if we take full account not only of old landmarks, and achieved successes, but also the less settled and more fluid contours of contemporary foreign policy. Finally, I am confident that those associated with you in Europe and America in the planning of these meetings could achieve such a balance without impairing the confidential and collegial character of these annual gatherings.

To my earlier gratitude I must now add my thanks for your patience with this elaboration of the sentiments I tried to voice at Knokke. With your indulgence, I am taking the liberty of sending copies to a few other conference participants.

With warmest regards,

Sincerely yours,

John Culver

JOHN C. CULVER

October 10, 1972

Mrs. N. le Roy
Bilderberg Secretariat
The Hague
Smidswater 1, The Netherlands

Dear Mrs. le Roy:

Thank you for your letter of September 28, 1972 Unfortunately I shall be unable to attend the Bilderberg Steering Committee Meeting at Soestdijk Palace on October 21 and 22. I shall be meeting with the American group on October 11, here in New York

With warm regards.

Sincerely yours,

Robert Murphy

RM:lb

BILDERBERG MEETINGS

The Hague, 28 September 1972

Dear Sir,

I have pleasure in reminding you that it was decided at the meeting of the Steering Committee in Knokke to hold the next meeting on Saturday, October 21st and Sunday, October 22nd.
The Saturday meeting will take place at Soestdijk Palace at 5 p.m., followed by a dinner at the Palace.
The Sunday meeting will go on at Soestdijk Palace and will close at 1 p.m., followed by a luncheon at the Palace.

You are kindly requested to inform the Secretariat as soon as possible whether you will attend the meeting of the Steering Committee.
It will probably be held for members of the Steering Committee a special bus leaves at about 1 o'clock.
Hotel Kasteel De Hooge Vuursche, Hilversumsestraatweg 14, Baarn, in the immediate neighbourhood of Soestdijk Palace, has been already reserved for some of the participants.

In case you wish this or any other hotel reservation and/or transport to and from the Palace, please inform the Secretariat about hotel ETC.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs.N.le Roy
Bilderberg Secretariat

JOHN C. CULVER
2d District, Iowa

COMMITTEES:
FOREIGN AFFAIRS
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

May 26, 1972

His Royal Highness
Bernhard
Prince of the Netherlands
Soestdijk Palace
Soestdijk, The Netherlands

Your Royal Highness:

I want very much to thank you for the opportunity to attend as well as for the effective yet gracious guidance you gave to the Bilderberg Conference, which I have now been privileged to attend twice. These gatherings offer a most welcome opportunity for direct exchange among those of us on both sides of the Atlantic in both public and private capacities who are concerned with common issues of public policy. I have both enjoyed and benefited from the opportunity on each occasion.

At the same time, I must confess that I have some misgivings about the tendency of a [illegible] as one to self-insulation and a rather [illegible] premium which is too oblivious to currents of public opinion and the changing environment in which policy must now be shaped and pursued. I count myself as determined as "internationalist" as anyone who was present at Knokke. But it takes only a slight play on words to suggest that there may be something dangerously "isolationist" about our meetings if they neither take account of nor closely analyze the existence of strongly held contrary views outside our ranks.

Take NATO as an example, since it figured in the, I fear unwelcome and perhaps belated remarks that I advanced. You will remember that I raised a question about the fixed assumption of an automatic U.S. armed response to any and every NATO contingency. Of course I personally have we would respond to a valid crisis, and I know that has been the pledge of each U.S. Administration since the Treaty was signed. But consider both the legal and political position. Under Article V of the Treaty, each party is obliged only to take such action as

it considers appropriate, which may or may not include the use of armed force, and even then its decision is to be taken only in accordance with its domestic constitutional processes. As a practical matter, the deterrent likelihood of an armed U.S. response has long been [illegible] by the presence of U.S. conventional and nuclear forces in the European theater, and by the designation of a U.S. general officer as Supreme Allied Commander. But there have been at least two recent developments call [illegible] stability of these arrangements, which I [illegible] more at our peril.

The first is the emergence of intensive and protracted debate within [illegible] constitutional disposition, as between [illegible] legislative branches of government, of any [illegible] armed conflict. Born of our Vietnam experience, [illegible] commitment of more than half a [illegible] either any real deliberat[illegible] by our Congress, this debate has [illegible] resolution, which has received [illegible] recently reported before the House of [illegible] restrict the President's independent [illegible] armed forces to action to a period of [illegible] affirmative approval of the [illegible] further continuation of hostilities. [illegible] that in the NATO context this might [illegible] making it clear that the [illegible] decisively within the [illegible] confrontation -- [illegible] U.S. opinion [illegible] have been very useful for us [illegible] confronted this situation at the Schwerpunkt [illegible], but unfortunately no one saw fit to [illegible] matters. The [illegible] that the [illegible] pressional and [illegible].

Second, there has been [illegible] about the immutability of [illegible] defense established twenty and more years ago. Times [illegible] have changed since the immediate post-war era, most notably [illegible] the strength and cohesion [illegible] cies in this regard have [illegible], and our voters not unnaturally wonder [illegible] cannot [illegible] for the overseas defense posture [illegible]. Specifically, they question the [illegible] the [illegible]

and Greece that are said to be necessary to support our NATO presence. And these questions require more than the incantation of an inherited orthodoxy but rather a rigorous examination of whether there can be orderly redistribution of burdens and responsibilities within the defense arrangements for Europe.

There seemed to be much satisfaction that the ghost of the Mansfield Amendment, for example, had been exorcised, but it is worth recalling that a substantial minority of Senators voted for at least one of the legislative attempts this amendment took. [illegible] more than one candidate for Presidential nomination has asserted very [illegible] stronger than Mr. Mansfield.

No doubt life would be more comfortable if bothersome questions like these could be made to go away. But I would suggest that they are inescapably with us, and that if we do not deal with them in some rational fashion we may find our future options very drastically curtailed. [illegible] between NATO as we have known it and some [illegible] of continued U.S. - European defense [illegible] which is open to us [illegible] preferable to the possibility that our future [illegible] irrevocable terms.

Nor does it seem to be any longer sufficient to comfort ourselves and override deep-seated [illegible] with historical analogues to the [illegible] among British University students, who when it came to actual hostilities did [illegible] "King and Country". There may be a great deal of validity in the reference, but it has also become a very refrain which does not so much reveal [illegible] as [illegible].

I do not wish to belabor the [illegible] personally can [illegible] or diplomatic expertise. It is [illegible] of such views could [illegible] larly elected legislature [illegible] haps have some role to play, [illegible] messenger both to and from [illegible] Bilderberg. [illegible] the political climate [illegible] first hand, and [illegible] ports and the [illegible] misunderstood or misstated [illegible] can also hope [illegible] to the doubts and questions [illegible] serves, and he cannot [illegible] proved at departing with [illegible] [illegible].

I am convinced that now is the time when those of us who do possess shared beliefs, must in our own self interest, confront honestly the necessity to continuously examine the presumptions and assumptions, both foreign and domestic, upon which our strategy is based and above all insure that the rationale given this foreign policy is currently meaningful, credible and acceptable to the people for whom it was intended to serve and upon whose support it is dependent for its success.

The problem which has concerned me at the Bilderberg meetings has been the gulf between the general security policy views of conference participants, however valid, and the contemporary attitudes and perceptions of European and American public opinion, and the refusal of conference members generally to soberly address themselves to this critical issue.

It would be my hope that perhaps more elements of realism, debate, and wider perspective might be incorporated in your future meetings. I would certainly not suggest that the builders and animators of Bilderberg pass from the scene. It is certainly equally important that the views of men now in high official position or in [illegible] position as well as men and women who play leading roles in business, communications, and other sectors of society [illegible] be clearly heard. All I would suggest with [illegible] that a somewhat wider diversity of viewpoints be involved and a more authentic canvas of relevant positions [illegible]. Unfortunately this is not an age of easy consensus within this country or in several others from which you draw conferees. I am well aware that the introduction of women and more youthful representation in recent conferences is the kind of innovation which responds to this sensed need. In this period of our history we are much more likely to sustain our foreign policies if we take full account not only of old landmarks, and achieved successes, but also the less settled and more fluid contours of contemporary foreign policy. Finally, I am confident that those associated with you in Europe and America in the planning of these meetings [illegible] and collegial character of these annual gatherings.

To my earlier gratitude I must now add my thanks for your patience with this elaboration of the sentiments I tried to voice at Krokke. With your indulgence, I am taking the liberty of sending copies to a few other conference participants.

With warmest regards.

Sincerely yours,

John C. Culver

A. G. S. GRIFFIN

TORONTO 1

22nd June, 1972.

Dear Ernst,

No doubt we should all be thinking about next year's Bilderberg subjects and on this I believe the urban problem is both topical and pressing. I enclose a copy of my letter to you of May 25th, 1970, since this letter sums up my thinking on the matter.

There are one or two first-class experts on this subject from here - including Jane Jacobs who has a world reputation.

I wonder what other subjects are being contemplated at this rather early stage?

Yours ever,

Tony

As to the other item which would succeed this year's University subject as the "main" item, I would like to put up for consideration "the problem of urban development and government which would include the serious social and economic problems of the cities, the discontents, tensions and frustrations inherent in urban living and the whole range of urban planning relating to these questions."

Mr. E. H. van der Beugel,
Bilderberg Meetings,
Smidswater 1,
THE HAGUE,
Holland.

Encl.
AGSG/MDA.

W-109

Daniel Janssen

INGEKOMEN 17 JULI

Bruxelles 6, le July 11, 19
4, Chaussée de Charleroi

Mr. E.H. van der BEUGEL,
Smidswater, 1,
DEN HAAG.

Dear Ernst,

I thank you very much for your Note of June 28 on the Bilderberg Meetings.

I felt in agreement with most of your points and thought it could perhaps be helpful to give you some of my remarks which of course you may circulate to the Steering Committee, if you thought appropriate to do so.

I will not comment on the points I find to be in total agreement.

For what concerns the working papers and topics, I couldn't agree more with you when you insist on having working papers presenting different or opposite points of views and concluding on a few clear points for discussion. I would like to add that the authors should make a full presentation of their working papers during a speech of maximum 15 minutes ; this time should not be spent to tall on points they have not included in that paper, but on the contrary to summarize clearly their whole paper and, as a conclusion, to stress a few stimulating questions for discussion.

For what concerns procedures at the meeting, I would agree with you that to focus attention, it would be preferable to stick to a preestablished schedule, taking into account tea and coffeebreak as well as lunch and 6 p.m. relax ; for the Sunday morning it seems you are right to insist on keeping that half-a-day mtg and closing it only at 1 p.m.

Finally for what concerns the participants, I have, like you, the impression that "the question of the young" is not usually very well put. Although it can be useful to have, for certain topics, some "under 30", the main preoccupation for me would be to have more "30 to 45" age level, who are the people which can be pointed out as the future top top ; on several topics their point of view is somewhat different from that of the "more than 60" age group. Therefore their opinion could be valuable for our discussions as well as for th future of Bilderberg.

These were some of my own comments to your very good note, and I am preparing myself to discuss it during our October 21 and 22 meetings.

Very sincerely yours,

PARKVEIEN 55
OSLO 2, August 2nd 1972

Professor Dr. E. H. van der Beugel
Bilderberg Meetings
The Hague

Dear Ernst,

Note on Bilderberg Meetings

Having been to every one of the Bilderberg Meetings except two I feel like coming forward with a few comments on your note, as I may not be present at the Meetings on the 21st and 22nd October.

The Bilderberg discussions were of course easier to handle in the beginning when the problems were more specific: "How to improve the relation between The United States and Western Europe." Since then we have taken on the whole world, which also makes the Steering Committee task of selecting the agenda more complex. But I think I can safely say that the handling of the Meetings on the part of the Chair and the Secretariate has constantly improved. The "One Minute Rule" has made the Meetings much more lively. That some - especially newcomers - talk longer than they should, is tiresome and works the other way, but also on this point there is some improvement.

The participants are generally well informed people, but often experts in some special field. When you say that a certain number of business men should be present, I think they should be business men with political and economic knowledge, alternatively financial. I do not consider Gabriel Hauge a business man, but an ideal participant on the business side. I am not sure I would call David a business man either, from a Bilderberg point of view.

Participants under 30 I do not think will be a success in future. That was an experiment which is now a bit out-of-date. People like Bill Moyers in that age are not easily found.

If you want non-establishment participants, one must get them somewhat older so that they are more definitely settled, or rather established, in what I in a previous letter to you called the "New Establishment". It is this New Establishment group which, in my part of the world anyway, has completely taken over and has succeeded in crushing or rather have overpowered what some years ago was named "The Establishment". I think it safe to say that the "New Establishment" is generally not particularly good in discussion on economic matters.

Yours sincerely,

Leif Lough

BILDERBERG MEETINGS

THE HAGUE,
SMIDSWATER 1
TELEPHONE 119068
TELEGRAMS BILDERMEETINGS

from a letter from Mr.Shepard Stone of August 16th 1972

Among people to be considered for the next major meeting:

Elisabeth Drew, Washington correspondent of the Atlantic Monthly, recently elected to the Board of Directors, Council on Foreign Relations;

Shirley Williams, Labor Shadow Minister.
She attended a meeting with me recently in London - brilliant and capable of being the UK's first woman Prime Minister;

Christopher Lasch, Professor of History - one of the young revisionist historians in the USA;

Senator Mondale of Minesota. An important man for the future.

As for the Japanese - if they come in as I hope -
Dr. Saburo Okita, President of the Japan Economic Research Council; President of the Japan Overseas Development Council. Saturo is a member of the International Association Board, very active, reliable, speeks excellent English, respected by Government and Opposition in Japan. He is also a member of the Aspen Institute Board. Age about 58.

International Council for Educational Development
522 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10036
212 TN 7-9450
Cable: INCEDEV
EWA CEI

Office of the Chairman

August 16, 1972

Mr. Ernst H. van der Beugel
Smidswater 1
The Hague
Netherlands

Dear Ernst:

Thank you very much for your excellent note on the Bildeberg meetings. I have been in a continuous travel status since the first of July and I am, in fact, dictating a reply to your letter from the Adirondacks, where I am on a brief holiday.

Now as to the substance of your note. First, paragraph 3(a) seems entirely clear to me. However, it does seem to me that the statement that "the particular aim" is to maintain and deepen the dialogue between North America and Western Europe has a direct relevance to paragraph 8(e), namely, the complicated problem of the Japanese. I would assume that if the Japanese are brought in as permanent members, the statement and purpose of 3(a) would have to be changed. This also applies, but in less vigorous form, to the inclusion of Australia.

My own view is that we should be extremely cautious about including any permanent members whose countries are not in either North America or Europe. This is not because the relations with the developing world or with Japan, Russia and China are not important; they may be decisively important. But it seems to me that the Bilderberg Conference has every capability of studying the relationships between the advantaged country in other parts of the world without having to include other countries in permanent membership. A business corporation or a university may surely study and express opinions about government policy without accepting the notion that the government becomes a part of the original discourse. So I think it is a trap, and an unnecessary one, to say that relations with Japan cannot be discussed unless the Japanese are permanent members of the Bilderberg group. But if they are, the central mission stated in 3(a) will have to be changed. Surely the Japanese cannot be invited to help "maintain and deepen the dialogue between America and Western Europe."

It may be that appropriate arrangements could be made with similar groups in the Far East, the Middle East or elsewhere for discussion for

items on the Bilderberg agenda, but it just may be that there are other organizations that could handle such dialogue better without destroying the central geist and cohesion of Bildeberg.

Second, I thoroughly agree that the important matter is to get different points of view rather than different age groups but one way to accomplish the first is to assure the second. I do not mean that all young people are radicals and all older people are conservatives. But we can remember that those born at the end of the last world war are now 27 years old and those who have had any direct involvement in European affairs, both during and after the war, are now probably in their sixties. I believe that Willy Brandt considers this gap in U.S. experience the most dangerous gap of all. That it corresponds with the age gap is an historical fact. It seems to be imperative that young people in their late twenties, thirties and early forties be brought into the Bilderberg discussions, not only because they may have different points of view, but possibly because they have no point of view at all, since they have had little or no direct experience with Atlantic affairs.

I do hope that the Bilderberg conferences will always find room for discussions of the political values and social structure that has made the Western World powerful, dynamic and, at times, cohesive. Industrial growth based upon technology is surely a central feature of the Western experience, but there are many, of whom I am one, who believes that the human drive that has made this development possible would have been unthinkable without the view of the nature and destiny of man implicit in the Christian-Judaic tradition. It would follow that the erosion in our system of beliefs is bound to have an impact on our future growth as well as our position in the rest of the world. For the leaders of the Western nations not to be deeply concerned with this matter seems to me dangerous. I do not suggest that religion or more general concern for human values be discussed as such, but I am urging attention to considerations which clearly and demonstrably interconnect and, indeed, support the stance and style of the Western World.

This letter is already too long so I will make some comments about logistical details in the margins of the letter you sent. In general, I have nothing much to add except the hope that some way can be developed for avoiding the long list of speakers who are to be recognized. To find yourself the eleventh person on the list means that when your time comes, the conversation may have wandered considerably from the point on which you wish to make a statement. The result is inevitably a series of set speeches that are not related to any other or the improvising of comments when your turn comes. May I suggest that a twenty to thirty minute period at the end of each discussion be available to speakers on a "hands up for recognition" basis, rather than on a list? I think it might make for a livelier discussion.

/more

You have asked for suggestions and of course suggestions inevitably promote notions for change and notions for change suggest that there might be a large dissatisfaction with the status quo. For this particular writer, I wish to reaffirm my sense of privilege at being included in these discussions -- the enor[illegible] pleasure I [illegible] the U.S., and particularly in Europe, [illegible] particularly the privilege of [illegible] sense that [illegible] of our western leaders [illegible] mind and flexibility of thought in a period of [illegible] dangerous change.

With warmest regards.

Sincerely,

James A. Perkins

JAP/jy

Enclosure

INGEKOMEN 13 SEP. 1972

Château de
BOIS-SEIGNEUR-ISAAC
1421 OPHAIN-BSI

Bois-Seigneur-Isaac, le 11 septembre 197 .

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

qui intéresse particulièrement l'Europe, ne peut pas r[illegible] inexploré par une institution comme le Bilderberg.

[illegible]

Monsieur le Professeur [illegible] van der BEGEL,
Bilderberg Meetings,
1, Zuidwater,
[illegible]

Les représentants
Jean Chach

JOSEPH E. JOHNSON
345 EAST 46TH STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017

June 6, 1972

RECEIVED
JUN 9 1972
AMORY HOUGHTON, JR.

Dear Bob:

Yes, in fact, I was aware of the point John Culver makes in his letter of 26 May. Indeed I have [illegible] the same time that there has been a tendency on the part of some Bilderbergers to wish that, in Culver's phrase "Kotchian questions have never come to the place to go away." Indeed I tried to make some at the same point at St. Castin a few years ago and I think Allison was addressing himself at Bad Ragaz to the issue raised in the second paragraph of Culver's letter on page 4.

I think that it may be well for the American members of the Steering Committee to give some thought to these issues before the October meeting of the Steering Committee.

Since I have referred to the Culver letter, I thought you might like to have your copy back again.

With best regards,

Cordially yours,

P.S. I have made a note of Mr. Houghton's thoughtful suggestion of Corning as the locus for the next Bilderberg held in this country and will bring it to the attention of our colleagues at the appropriate time.

The Honorable Robert D. Murphy
Corning Glass Internationsl
717 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10022

and Greece that are said to be necessary to support our NATO presence. And these questions require more than the incantation of an inherited orthodoxy but rather a rigorous examination of whether there can be orderly redistribution of burdens and responsibilities within the defense arrangements for Europe.

There seemed to be much satisfaction that the ghost of the Mansfield Amendment, for example, had been exorcised, but it is worth recalling that a solid majority of Senators voted for at least one of the legislative embodiments this amendment took. And more than one candidate for Presidential nomination has asserted versions even stronger than Mr. Mansfields'.

No doubt life would be more comfortable if bothersome questions like these could be made to go away. But I would suggest that they are inescapably with us, and that if we do not deal with them in some rational fashion we may find our future options very drastically curtailed. A choice between NATO as we have known it and some modified and restructured form of continued U.S. - European defense collaboration -- which is open to us today -- seems to me far preferable to the possibility that our future choice may be posed in stark and irrevocable terms.

Nor does it seem to me any longer sufficient to comfort ourselves and override deep-seated public doubts with historical analogues to the Oxford oath and to pre-World War II pacifism among British university students, who when it came to actual hostilities did then acquit themselves most nobly for their "King and Country". There may be an element of validity in the reference, but it has also become an easy refrain which does not so much reveal truths as smother genuine debate.

I do not wish to belabor the point at excessive length. I personally can lay no claim to statesmanship or diplomatic expertise. It is quite possible that the open ventilation of such views could prove somewhat unsettling. But a popularly elected legislator in a democratic society does perhaps have some role to play, and some responsibility, as a messenger both to and from international conferences like Bilderberg. He can try as I did to convey some sense of the political climate that he knows as a professional at first hand, and he must be disappointed if the views he reports and the public and political currents he senses are misunderstood or misattributed as his own heresies. He can also hope to carry back with him some careful answers to the doubts and questions of those whom and with whom he serves, and he cannot but be dismayed at departing with such hopes unfulfilled.

I am convinced that now is the time when those of us who do possess shared beliefs, must in our own self interest, confront honestly the necessity to continuously examine the presumptions and assumptions, both foreign and domestic, upon which our strategy is based and above all insure that the rationale given this foreign policy is currently meaningful, credible and acceptable to the people for whom it was intended to serve and upon whose support it is dependent for its success.

The problem which has concerned me at the Bilderberg meetings has been the gulf between the general security policy views of conference participants, however valid, and the contemporary attitudes and perceptions of European and American public opinion, and the refusal of conference members generally to soberly address themselves to this critical issue.

It would be my hope that perhaps such elements of realism, debate, and widened perspective might be incorporated in your future meetings. I would certainly not suggest that the builders and animators of Bilderberg pass from the scene. It is certainly equally important that the views of men now in high official position or in former high position as well as men and women who play leading roles in business, communications, and other sectors of private life be clearly heard. All I would suggest with utmost respect is that a somewhat wider diversity of viewpoint be achieved and a more authentic canvas of relevant positions made. Unfortunately this is not an age of easy consensus either in my country or in several others from which you draw conferees. I am well aware that the introduction of women and more youthful representation in recent conferences is the kind of innovation which responds to this sensed need. In this period of our history we are much more likely to sustain our foreign policies if we take full account not only of old landmarks, and achieved successes, but also the less settled and more fluid contours of contemporary foreign policy. Finally, I am confident that those associated with you in Europe and America in the planning of these meetings could achieve such a balance without impairing the confidential and collegial character of these annual gatherings.

To my earlier gratitude I must now add my thanks for your patience with this elaboration of the sentiments I tried to voice at Knokke. With your indulgence, I am taking the liberty of sending copies to a few other conference participants.

With warmest regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. CULVER
MEMBER OF CONGRESS

FROM

ROBERT MURPHY

[illegible]

0604

[illegible] ous to currents of public opinion on the changing environment in which policy must remain sound and flexible. I count myself as determined an "internationalist" as anyone who has present at Yalta. But it takes only a little time on words to suggest that there may be some who are unfortunately "isolationist" about our positions if they neither take account of nor closely analyze the existence of strongly held contrary views outside our ranks.

Take NATO as an example, since it figured in the, I fear unwelcome and perhaps belated remarks that I advanced. You will remember that I raised a question about the fixed assumption of an automatic U.S. armed response to any and every NATO contingency. Of course I personally hope we would respond to a valid crisis, and I know that has been the pledge of each U.S. Administration since the Treaty was signed. But consider both the legal and political position. Under Article V of the Treaty, each party is obliged only to take such action as

FOREIGN AFFAIRS
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

May 26, 1972

His Royal Highness
Prince of the Netherlands
Soestdijk Palace
Soestdijk, The Netherlands

Your Royal Highness:

I want very much to thank you for the opportunity to attend as well as for the effective yet gracious guidance you gave to the Bilderberg Conference, which I have now been privileged to attend twice. These gatherings offer a most welcome opportunity for direct exchange among those of us on both sides of the Atlantic in both public and private capacities who are concerned with common issues of public policy. I have both enjoyed and benefited from the opportunity on each occasion.

At the same time, I must confess that I have some misgivings about the tendency of a conference such as this one to self-insulation and a rather closed consensus which is too oblivious to currents of public opinion and the changing environment in which policy must now be shaped and pursued. I count myself as determined as "internationalist" as anyone who was present at Knokke. But it takes only a slight play on words to suggest that there may be something dangerously "isolationist" about our meetings if they neither take account of nor closely analyze the existence of strongly held contrary views outside our ranks.

Take NATO as an example, since it figured in the, I fear unwelcome and perhaps belated remarks that I advanced. You will remember that I raised a question about the fixed assumption of an automatic U.S. armed response to any and every NATO contingency. Of course I personally hope to [illegible] resort to a valid crisis, and I know that has been the pledge of each U.S. Administration since the Treaty was signed. But consider both the legal and political position. Under Article V of the Treaty, each party is obliged only to take such action as

it considers appropriate, which may or may not include the use of armed force, and even then its decision is to be taken only in accordance with its constitutional processes. As a practical matter, the [illegible] of an armed [illegible] of the presence of U.S. [illegible] matter, [illegible] developments [illegible] the possibility of these arrangements [illegible] peril.

The first is the emergence of [illegible] constitutional debate within the Congress [illegible] restrictive [illegible] of war-making [illegible] of powers [illegible] to armed conflict. [illegible] of our [illegible] area, [illegible] commitment [illegible] of more [illegible] without any real deliberation [illegible] by our forces, [illegible] resolution," [illegible] currently pending [illegible] restrict the [illegible] before the [illegible] armed forces to [illegible] action to a [illegible] affirmative approval of the Congress [illegible] for further continuation of [illegible]. It is [illegible] that, in the [illegible] context this [illegible] actually be [illegible] to our allies, by making it clear [illegible] could proceed quickly and decisively within [illegible] of an armed confrontation -- which in this [illegible] of [illegible] U.S. opinion is [illegible] clear. It would have been very useful for us to have [illegible] situation at the [illegible] frontier, but unfortunately no one saw fit to [illegible] that the Congressional and public concerns were [illegible] matters. The dominant feeling [illegible] were [illegible].

Second, there has been growing doubt in the United States about the immutability of arrangements for mutual defense established twenty and more years ago. Times surely have changed since the immediate post-War era, [illegible] notably in the strength and cohesiveness of Western [illegible]. Our policies in this regard have proven very successful, and our voters not unnaturally wonder why the U.S. cannot modify its overseas defense posture in the light of such success. Specifically, they question the need for maintaining the exact force level of [illegible] troops in place in [illegible] twenty years after they were first sent there, along with bases in Spain

and Greece that are said to be necessary to support our NATO presence. And these questions require more than the incantation of an inherited orthodoxy but rather a rigorous examination of whether there can be orderly redistribution of burdens and responsibilities within the defense arrangements for Europe.

There seemed to be much satisfaction that the ghost of the Mansfield Amendment, for example, had been exorcised, but it is worth recalling that a solid majority of Senators voted for at least one of the legislative embodiments this amendment took. And more than one candidate for Presidential nomination has asserted versions even stronger than Mr. Mansfields'.

No doubt life would be more comfortable if bothersome questions like these could be made to go away. But I would suggest that they are inescapably [illegible] us, and that if we do not deal with them in some rational fas .on we may find our future options very drastically curtailed. A choice between NATO [illegible] is open to us today -- [illegible] sibility that our future choice may be posed in stark and irrevocable terms.

Nor does it seem to me any longer sufficient to comfort ourselves [illegible] doubts with historical [illegible] the reference, but it has also become an easy refrain which does not so much reveal truths as smother genuine debate.

I do not wish to belabor the point at excessive length. I [illegible] hopes unfulfilled.

I am convinced that now is the time when those of us who do [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

To: The Honorable R. D. Murphy

From: Amory Houghton, Jr. May 12, 1972

Dear Mr. Murphy:

Would it be interesting some time to think of having the Bilderberg Conference here in Corning? Would it be worthy of suggestion?

AHJr:mp

2 May 1972

Dear Sir,

Please find enclosed the Minutes of the two meetings of the Steering Committee at the Knokke Conference.

Because of your absence at the Steering Committee meeting of Sunday, April 23rd, I would like to draw your special attention to the last part of these Minutes.

Yours sincerely,

N.le Roy

Prince expressed his gratitude to Mr. Wallenberg for his invitation.

There was general agreement that it would be useful to discuss at the next meeting of the Steering Committee not only the Agenda and the list of participants Saltsjöbaden meeting, but to spend some time on several substantive and procedural questions about the annual meeting (composition, size, Japanese participants, subjects, etc.).

It was therefore decided that the next meeting of the Steering Committee would be divided in two. One half would be spent on these general questions, the other half as usual on the problems of the next annual meeting.

subjects, etc.).

It was therefore decided

would be spent on these general

half as usual on the problems of the next annual meeting.

[illegible]

[illegible] Soestdijk Palace [illegible] Saturday, October [illegible], the [illegible] will then [illegible] together and will meet again on Sunday morning, October 22nd at Soestdijk Palace at 11 [illegible].

In these circumstances, it will probably be easier [illegible] of 21-22 October in a hotel in the immediate neigh[illegible] Soestdijk Palace.

The Secretariat will be glad to make the neces[illegible].

BILDERBERG MEETINGS

KNOKKE CONFERENCE
21, 22 and 23 April 1972
(arrival 20 April)

7

FINAL LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

H.R.H. the Prince of the NETHERLANDS
Chairman

Ernst H. van der BEUGEL
Professor International Relations, Leiden University
Honorary Secretary General for Europe

Joseph E. JOHNSON
President Emeritus, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Honorary Secretary General for the United States

C. Frits KARSTEN
Managing Director, AMRO Bank N.V.
Honorary Treasurer

AUSTRALIA

BROWN, Neil A.
Member of Parliament

WESTERMAN, Sir Alan
Chairman of the Board of Directors, The Australian Industry Development Corporation

BELGIUM

JANSSEN, Daniel
Director-Deputy General Manager, UCB S.A.
Lecturer, Brussels University

JANSSEN, Paul
Director-Member of the Management Committee, Société Générale de Banque

CEMU, Louis
Chairman, Banque de Bruxelles S.A.

DAVIGNON, Vicomte
Director General Political Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

(BELGIUM)

LAMBERT, Baron
Chairman, Banque Lambert S.A.

SNOY et d'OPPUERS, Baron
Managing Director, Compagnie Lambert pour l'Industrie et la Finance

SOLVAY, Jacques
Chairman, Solvay & Cie. S.A.

VANDEPUTTE, Robert
Governor, National Bank of Belgium

CANADA

GRIFFIN, Anthony C.S.
President, Triarch Corporation Ltd.

MacLAREN, Roy
Director, Public Relations-Corporate, Massey-Ferguson Ltd.

McLEAN, William F.
President, Canada Packers Ltd.

RAYMAULD, André
Chairman, Economic Council of Canada

WARREN, Jack H.
High Commissioner for Canada in the U.K.

DENMARK

NØRLUND, Niels
Editor, 'Berlingske Tidende'

SØRENSEN, Svend O.
General Manager, Den Danske Landmandsbank

TEPREELSEN, Terkel M.
Editor-in-Chief, 'Berlingske Tidende

FINLAND

NYKOPP, Johan A.
President, Oy Tampella Ab

FRANCE

BAUMGARTNER, Wilfrid S.

President, Rhône-Poulenc S.A.
Honorary Governor, Banque de France

DAVID-WEILL, Michel

Partner, Lazard Frères [illegible]

GIROUD, Françoise

Director and Editor-in-Chief of [illegible]

MOSS, Simon

Director General, Librairie Hachette

MIROUD, Jean

President, Schlumberger Ltd.

ROTHSCHILD, Baron Edmond de

Director of Companies

SAUGUET, Yves

Director of the Cabinet of the Minister of Labour

TATU, Michel

Chief of the Foreign Section of [illegible]

GERMANY

[illegible]

Ambassador of the Federal German Republic to the Netherlands

BIEDENKOPF, Kurt

Member of Parliament
Chairman of the Board, August Thyssen-Hütte A.G.

COSTRIER, Peter

[illegible]

HOFFOFF, Marion Gräfin

Chief Editor Die Zeit

[illegible]

State Secretary for European Affairs

HOPPISEN, Ernst W.

Secretary of State for Defence

SCHRODER, Gerhard

Member of Parliament
Chairman of the Commission for Foreign Affairs of the Bundestag

[illegible]

Chairman of the [illegible]

ICELAND

HALLGRIMSSON, Geir

Mayor of Reykjavik,
Member of Parliament

INTERNATIONAL

DAHRENDORF, Ralf

Member of the European Economic Commission

DENIAU, Jean-François

Member of the Commission of the European Communities

[illegible]

President of the European Community Institute for University Studies

LEEMANS, Jonkheer Emile van

Secretary General, O.E.C.D.

LOUDON, Jonkheer John B.

President, The Atlantic Institute

LUNS, Joseph M.A.H.

Secretary General N.A.T.O.

ITALY

AGNELLI, Giovanni

President, FIAT S.p.A.

[illegible]

Association pour l'Etude des Problèmes de l'Europe

[illegible]

Director, Strategic Planning, Montedison S.p.A.

COLONNA di PALIANO, Prince Guido

President, La Rinascente S.p.A.

[illegible]

Director General Political Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

[illegible]

Journalist, 'La Stampa'

[redacted]

DIJKGRAAF, Anton F.J.

Member of the Presidium of Algemene Bank Nederland

't HOOFT, Maria J.

Professor at the Rotterdam School of Economics
Director of the Economic Institute of the Free University

KOSTER, Henri J. de

Minister of Defence

NEYNEN, Johannes

Former Deputy Chairman, AKZO N.V.

NETHERLANDS, H.R.H. Princess Beatrix of the

NETHERLANDS, H.R.H. Prince Claus of the

PITIJN, Schelto

Director, 'Europa Instituut' of Leiden University

WAGNER, Gerrit A.

President, Royal Dutch Petroleum Company

TIJLSTRA, Jelle

President, De Nederlandse Bank

NORWAY

HØEGH, Leif

Shipowner

STIP, Helge

Member of Parliament

[redacted]

Shipowner

[redacted]

ESPIRITO SANTO SILVA, Manuel R.

Chairman, Banco Espirito Santo e Comercial de Lisboa

MOCUFIRA, Alberto F.

Chairman, Foreign Affairs Commission, National Assembly

SWEDEN

WALLENBERG, Marcus

Chairman, Skandinaviska Enskilda Banken

SWITZERLAND

FLEINER, Thomas

Professor for Law and International Relations,
University of Fribourg

JOLLES, Paul

Director of the Federal Division of Commerce

RIVERDIN, Olivier

Member of the Upper House of the Swiss Parliament
Chairman of the Council of Europe

UMBRICHT, Victor H.

Member of the Board of Directors, CIBA-GEIGY Limited

TURKEY

BEYAZIT, Selahattin

Director of Companies

BIRGI, M. Nuri

Former Ambassador to N.A.T.O.

UNITED KINGDOM

BENNETT, Sir Frederic

Member of Parliament

BROWNE, John

Chairman, Butterfield & Swire Ltd., Hong Kong

BUCHAN, The Hon. Alastair

Professor of International Relations, University of Oxford

KEARTON, The Lord

Chairman, Courtaulds Limited

LEVER, Harold,

Member of Parliament

WHITELAW, Reginald

Member of Parliament
Secretary of State for Home Affairs

REES-MOGG, William

Editor , The Times

WOLL, Sir Eric

Deputy Chairman, S.G. Warburg & Co. Ltd.

(UNITED KINGDOM)

SUMMERSKILL, Shirley
Member of Parliament

UNITED STATES

BALL, George W.
Senior Managing Director, Lehman Brothers Incorporated

BERGSTEN, C. Fred
Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution

BLUMENTHAL, Michael
Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer
Bendix Corporation

BRIMMER, Andrew
Member of the Federal Reserve Board

BRZEZINSKI, Zbigniew
Director, Research Institute on Communist Affairs,
Columbia University

CAMPS, Miriam
Senior Research Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations

COLLADO, Emilio G.
Executive Vice-President, Standard Oil Company (New Jersey)

CULVER, John S.
Member of Congress

DEAN, Arthur H.
Senior Partner, Sullivan & Cromwell

HAUGE, Gabriel
Chairman of the Board, Manufacturers Hanover Trust
Company

HEINZ II, Henry J.
Chairman of the Board, H.J. Heinz Company

HOUGHTON Jr., Amory
Chairman of the Board, Corning Glass

[illegible], Thomas,
President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

[illegible], Bayless
President, Council on Foreign Relations

MATHIAS, Charles McC.
U.S. Senator

MURPHY, Robert D.
Honorary Chairman of the Board, Corning Glass International

THE HAGUE, 1 March 1972

SCHEVENINGSEWEG 1

TELEPHONE 111060

TELEGRAMS BILDERBERGKONINGEN

To: The members of the
Steering Committee

From: Ernst H. van der Beugel

We agreed at the last meeting of the Steering Committee that the two papers of Mr. [illegible] and Mr. [illegible] and myself will be discussed on the first day (Friday) of the Rokko Conference.

In the meantime, Mr. [illegible], member of the Canadian [illegible] of the Steering Committee, has been approached and is willing to open the discussion with a statement which, as usual, will take longer than five minutes.

We also agreed that a Canadian participant will open the discussion on the second day when the papers of Mr. [illegible] and The Hon. Alastair Buchan will be discussed.

As soon as we know whether this is acceptable to one of the Canadian participants, I will inform you.

H. J. HEINZ II

PITTSBURGH

November 16, 1971

Dear Bob:

Enclosed is a report of where we stand on our next year's Bilderberg budget.

We have pledges of $10,000 and while I have never called on you before, do you think it would be possible for you to contribute something to help? As you know, we are only a handful of regulars.

[illegible] on some other friendly foundations for [illegible]

Sincerely,

Jack

The Hon. Robert Murphy
Corning Glass International
717 Fifth Avenue
[illegible]

r 16, 1971

, the Ford Foundation's
30, 1971.

[illegible]

$55,547.77

$9,000.00

[illegible]

Travel, participant- [illegible]	[illegible]		
facilities	16,996.88		
Interpreters, secretarial services	3,418.65		
Supplies, equipment	6,219.98		
Insurance	350.00	37,983.72	
Telephone, telegraph, postage		695.21	
Miscellaneous expenses		112.20	
			49,846.73

[illegible]

HENRY J. HEINZ II
P.O. BOX 57
PITTSBURGH, PA. 15230

November 16, 1971

Mr. David Rockefeller
The Hon. George Ball
Mr. Arthur Dean
Mr. Emilio Collado

Gentlemen:

Re: Bilderberg

As you probably know, our company's grant, the Ford Foundation's second 3-year grant of $50,000 terminated June 30, 1971.

For your interest, I present our income and expenditures for last year --July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971:-

INCOME (including $26,000 from FF)		-	$55,547.77
EXPENDITURES			
Contribution towards expenses of Hague Secretariat		$9,000.00	
Steering Com. Meetings (2)		1,497.60	
Bad Ragaz Meeting			
Travel expenses	$158.00		
Background paper	400.00	558.00	
Woodstock Meeting			
Travel, participants	10,998.21		
Lodging, meeting facilities	16,996.88		
Interpreters, secretarial services	3,418.65		
Supplies, equipment	6,219.98		
Insurance	350.00	37,983.72	
Telephone, telegraph, postage		695.21	
Miscellaneous expenses		112.71	
		[illegible]	
Balance -----			5,701.04

Requirements for July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972:-

European Secretariat	$9,000
Support of U. S. participation	
Secretarial assistance (part time)	4,500
Travel to Steering Committee Mtg.	2,500
Travel of participants to Knokke (Belgium)	7,000
Background papers	800
Stationary, postage, telephone, telegraph	800
	$24,600
Unexpended balance -	5,700
Net -	18,900

Sincerely,

Jack

HJH II/mjn

Copies: Dr. Gabriel Hauge
The Hon. Robert Murphy

BILDERBERG MEETINGS

The Hague, 29 December 1971
Smidswater 1
Telephone 113565
Telegrams: Bilderbergmeetings

SUGGESTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS
FROM THE U.K.

Sir Alec DOUGLAS-HOME	Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs
or	
Lord CARRINGTON	Secretary of State for Defence
Harold LEVER	Member of Parliament (Labour)
John BROWNE	Chairman of Cathay Pacific

With respect to an eventual Australian participation , Sir Frederic Bennett made the following suggestion:

Neil BROWN	Member of Parliament

We are expecting one further suggestion for a participant from the U.K.

BILDERBERG MEETINGS

THE HAGUE, 3 January 1972
AMSTERDAMSE 1
TELEFOONNR 070-
TELEGRAMA BILDERBERGMEETINGS

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE
STEERING COMMITTEE

7

Dear Sir,

Further to the list with suggested Netherlands participants of November 22nd, I am sending you herewith two more suggestions for this list.

Mrs. Prof. Dr. H.J.'t Hooft-Welvaars
Professor of Economics, Rotterdam University

J. van Tijn
Journalist, "Vrij Nederland"

Sincerely yours,

N. le Roy

N.le Roy

BILDERBERG MEETINGS

THE HAGUE, 30 December 1971
AMSTERDAMSE 1
TELEFOONNR 070-
TELEGRAMA BILDERBERGMEETINGS

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE
STEERING COMMITTEE

Dear Sir,

I am sending you herewith two more lists with suggestions for participants for the Knokke Conference.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

N.le Roy

FIAT

Direzione Relazioni Esterne
Il Direttore

Turin, December 21st, 1971

Prof. Ernst H. van der Beugel
Honorary Secretary General
for Europe
Bilderberg Meetings
Smidswater 1
The Hague

Dear Prof. van der Beugel,

With reference to your letter of November 30th, I am glad to enclose the list of Italian representatives to whom Mr. Agnelli would suggest to extend the invitation for the annual Conference.

However, at this stage, I cannot say which of them will be able to participate to it. Anyway, I will not fail to let you know as soon as I get their final confirmation to this end.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

(Vittorino Chiusano)

Encl.

Fiat S.p.A. 10100 Torino Corso Marconi 10 Telefono 6565

Prof. Umberto COLOMBO
Direttore
Istituto Donegani
Largo Donegani, 1/2
20121 - Milano

Prof. Dino DEL BO
Presidente ISPI
Via Clerici, 5
20121 - Milano

Amb. Roberto DUCCI
Direttore Generale
degli Affari Politici
Ministero degli Affari Esteri
00100 - Roma

Dr. Arrigo LEVI
Via Guattani, 14a int. 8
00161 - Roma

Dr. Fosco MARAINI
Via Magalotti, 6
50122 - Firenze